



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1459 Alexandra, Vrgmia 22313-1450 www.appi.gov

APPLICATION NO	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/681,008 11/15/2000		11/15/2000	Johann Engelhardt	102847-28	1885	
29127	7590	11/21/2003		EXAMINER		
HOUSTON ELISEEVA				FERNANDEZ, KALIMAH		
4 MILITIA I						
LEXINGTO	N, MA (02421	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				2881		

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		App	lication No.	Applicant(s)		
			681,008	ENGELHARDT,	ENGELHARDT, JOHANN	
		y Exa	miner	Art Unit	1	
	_	Kalii	mah Fernandez	2881	}	
ania al S	The MAILING DATE of this com or Reply	munication appears	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress	
THE - Exterent after aft	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIC MAILING DATE OF THIS COMM rations of time may be available under the prov SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this period for rely specified above is less than it re to reply within the set or extended period for reply verticed by the Office later than time am ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704	MUNICATION. risions of 37 CFR 1 136(a). In communication. ririty (30) days, a reply within in the statutory period will apply reply will, by statute, cause onths after the mailing date of	n no event, however, may a the statutory minimum of the y and will expire SIX (6) MC the application to become	a reply be timely filed iirty (30) days will be considered tim DNTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U S.C \$ 130.	ely. communication,	
	Responsive to communication(s	s) filed on 21 August	2003			
	This action is FINAL.	2b) ☐ This action				
	Since this application is in condi closed in accordance with the p	ition for allowance ex	xcept for formal ma		ne merits is	
isposit	ion of Claims			,		
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 8-22 is/are	pending in the appli	ication.			
,	4a) Of the above claim(s)					
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)🛛	Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 8-22 is/are	rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected t					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to re	striction and/or elec	tion requirement.			
pplicat	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to b	y the Examiner.				
10)🛛	The drawing(s) filed on 15 Nove			- , ,	miner.	
	Applicant may not request that any	•				
44)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) inclu	-		• · · ·		
	The oath or declaration is object	•	er. Note the attache	ed Office Action of form F	10-152.	
-	inder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			0.440(.)(.)) (0.		
	Acknowledgment is made of a c		ity under 35 U.S.C	. 9 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
	1. Certified copies of the price					
	2. Certified copies of the prior3. Copies of the certified copies				I Stage	
	application from the Intern			n received in this Mationa	ii Staye	
	See the attached detailed Office a					
s 3	Acknowledgment is made of a cla ince a specific reference was incl 7 <u>CF</u> R 1.78.	luded in the first sent	tence of the specifi	cation or in an Application	al application n Data Shee	
) The translation of the foreign					
	Acknowledgment is made of a cla eference was included in the first					
re	t(s)					
ttachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Revi			Summary (PTO-413) Paper No Informal Patent Application (P		

881,008 Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/681,008

Art Unit: 2881

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 2. Claims 1-2,4-6, and 8-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 5,881,045 issued to Inoue and in view of US Pat No 6,275,454 issued to Boutaghou et al.
- 3. Inoue teaches a specimen (i.e. CD) receiving device for hold a plurality of specimens (i.e. CD) (col. 3, lines 1-20;col.5, lines 29-42).
- Inoue teaches said specimen receiving device being linearly displaceable via transport mechanism (col.3, lines 16-20; col.9, lines 40-67).
- 5. Inoue teaches said specimen receiving device being rotatable about the axis of rotation (col.5, lines 50-53).
- 6. Inoue teaches said scanning device (30) provided for optically scanning the specimen (col. 6, lines 5-7).

- 7. Further, Inoue teaches the use of a movable scanning device /optical head (col.6. lines 8-17).
- Inoue does not explicitly teach said scanning device/optical head being linearly displaceable and being rotatable.
- 9. However, Boutaghou et al teaches a scanning device/ optical head which is both linearly displaceable and rotatable about an axis (16) of rotation (col.3, lines 18-42; see figs. 1-2).
- 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Inoue and Boutaghou et al since Boutaghou et al teaches an improved positioning mechanism (col.1, lines 35-44).
- 11. As per claim 2, Boutaghou et al teaches the specimen receiving device defines a rotation speed of the specimen and the scanning device remains substantially constant during a relative motion between the scanning device and the specimen-receiving device (col.3, lines 18-32).
- 12. As per claim 4, Boutaghou et al teaches a constant optical distance between a specimen and the scanning device (col.3, lines 29-32).
- 13. As per claim 5, Boutaghou et al teaches said specimen receiving device defines a rotation speed of the specimen receiving device, and the

Art Unit: 2881

rotation speed is dependent on the relative position between the specimen receiving device and the scanning device (col.3, lines 27-32).

- 14. As claim 6, Boutaghou et al teaches the rotation speed is dependent on a detected data stream of the scanning device (col.3, line 62-col.4, line5).
- 15. As per claims 8-12, Inoue teaches a replacable, single vessel/carousel insert (i.e. cd) on a carriage (col.5, lines 22-41; col.5, lines 42-53).
- 16. As per claim 13, Boutaghou et al teaches an auto-focusing means(44) maintaining the specimen in focus (col.3, lines 43-51).
- 17. As per claim 14 and 19-20, Boutaghou et al teaches focusing a specimen. Boutaghou et al does not teach the recited ranges; however, it is held that focal variables are result-effective variable. That is, the selection of the values of the recited focal variable will achieve an art-recognized result.
- 18. As per claim 15, Boutaghou et al teaches a laser source (58) and a detector (60) (col.3, lines 52-55).
- As per claim 16, Boutaghou et al teaches said laser beam being scanned /deflected at least one directions (col.2, lines 52-64).

Application/Control Number: 09/681,008 Art Unit: 2881

- As per claim 17, Boutaghou et al teaches said laser beam is stationary relative to the scanning device (20) (col.3, lines 52-66; fig. 3).
- 21. As per claim 18, Boutaghou et al teaches said laser beam provided for scanning can be of different wavelengths (col.4, lines 16-20). Namely, Boutaghou et al teaches the ability to select different wavelengths depend on the mode of operation; therefore, Boutaghou et al teaches scanning in different wavelengths.
- 22. As per claim 21, Boutaghou et al teaches said laser beam defines an non-zero incidence angle on the surface of the specimen receiving device (see fig. 2).
- 23. As per claim 22, Botaghou et al teaches synchronization markers provided on the specimen (col.4, lines 20-22).

Response to Arguments

24. Applicant's arguments filed 8/21/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. First, applicant contends that the claimed invention is patentable over the obvious combination of Inoue and Boutaghou since the claimed invention is related to optical scanning microscopy while the prior art is related to CD player technology.

- 25. In response, the recitation "in a confocal scanning microscope" is merely intended use. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations
- 26. Here, the obvious combination of Inoue and Boutaghou satisfies the structural limitations of the recited optical scanning apparatus. The fact that Inoue and Boutaghou are employed in a CD player rather than a confocal scanning microscope does not distinguish the claimed invention such that it would be deem patentable.
- 27. Second, applicant asserts, "Inoue does not disclose a specimen receiving device for holding a plurality of specimens." Applicant presumably relies on the claim language "a specimen receiving device for holding a plurality of specimens" to support this assertion. It is pointed out that Inoue teaches a specimen-receiving device (200) capable of receiving up to 15 specimens (i.e. CD) (col.5, lines 29-41).
- 28. In addition, the claim language neither requires scanning a plurality of specimens at the same time nor prohibits apparatuses that hold a plurality

Application/Control Number: 09/681,008

Art Unit: 2881

of specimens and scan each specimen when the operator desires as in Inoue.

Conclusion

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalimah. Fernandez whose

telephone number is 703-305-6310. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs between 7:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R Lee can be reached on 703-308-4116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9318.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

kf

